# EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

LAW OFFICES OF

## PAUL.HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

1299 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2400

TELEPHONE (202) 508-9500

FACSIMILE (202) 508-9700

INTERNET www.phjw.com

ROBERT P. HASTINGS (1910-1996)

HARLES M. WALKER

COUNSEL

600 PEACHTREE ST., N.E., STE. 2400 ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30308-2222 TELEPHONE (404) 815-2400

695 TOWN CENTER DRIVE COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626-1924 TELEPHONE (714) 668-6200

TOWER 42 25 OLD BROAD STREET LONDON ECZN IHQ TELEPHONE 44 (171) 562-4000

555 SOUTH FLOWER STREET LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071-2371 TELEPHONE (213) 683-6000

> writer's direct access (202)508-9570 cwnorthrop@phjw.com

TEVERAL COMMUNICATIONS CO AMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY Magalie Roman Salas, Esquire Secretary, Federal Communications Commission Suite TW-A325 445 Twelfth Street, S.W. Washington, DC 20554

399 PARK AVENUE NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-4697 TELEPHONE (212) 318-6000

345 CALIFORNIA STREET SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104-2635 TELEPHONE (415) 835-1600

1055 WASHINGTON BOULEVARD STAMFORD, CONNECTICUT 06901-2217 TELEPHONE (203) 961-7400

> ARK MORI BUILDING 12-32, AKASAKA I-CHOME MINATO-KU, TOKYO 107, JAPAN TELEPHONE (03) 3586-4711

RECEIVED OUR FILE NO.

Jan 3 4 2000

FEVERAL TO STREET ATTOMS COMMISCHED OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Re: Notice of Ex Parte Presentation

> Clarification of the Commission's Rules on Interconnection Between LECs and Paging Carriers, CCB/CPD No. 97-24 ("SWBT clarification request")

Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, First Report & Order, CC Docket Nos/96-98, 95-185 ("Local Competition First Report & Order")

Formal Complaint of TSR Paging Inc. against US West Communications Inc., File No. E-98-10 (filed December 24, 1997)

Formal Complaint of Metrocall against Various LECs, File Nos. E-98-14-18 (filed January 20, 1998)

Formal Complaint of Arch Communications Group, Inc. against US WEST Communications, Inc., File No. E-99-05 (filed December 3, 1998)

Formal Complaint of Arch Communications Group, Inc. against BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., File No. E-99-06 (filed December 7, 1998)

Formal Complaint of MAP Mobile Communications, Inc. against US West Communications, Inc. File No. E-99-11 (filed March 4,1999)

Dear Ms. Salas:

On January 18, 2000, Mark Stachiw, a Vice President and Senior Counsel of AirTouch Paging ("AirTouch"), and the undersigned met in separate meetings with rec'd Listabode

### PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

Magalie Roman Salas, Esquire Secretary, Federal Communications Commission January 20, 2000 Page 2

Ari Fitzgerald, Helgi Walker, Adam Krinsky, Peter Tenhula and Mark Schneider in the offices of Chairman Kennard and Commissioners Furtchgott-Roth, Tristani, Powell and Ness, respectively, to discuss LEC/paging interconnection issues. Rob Hoggarth of the Personal Communications Industry Association ("PCIA") joined in the meetings with Messrs. Fitzgerald and Krinsky.

AirTouch reported to the Commission that, although it has been able to reach interconnection agreements with multiple local exchange carriers, significant unresolved issues remain outstanding with U S WEST as evidenced by litigation of public record before the Federal District Court in Denver Colorado (the "Denver Court"). AirTouch also indicated that it has reached an interconnection agreement with SBC covering the state of California, but has yet to reach agreement with SBC in other non-Ameritech states in which the parties interconnect. (AirTouch entered into agreements with Ameritech prior to its merger with SBC).

AirTouch pointed out to the Commission that many of AirTouch's interconnection agreements with LECs reflect termination rates comparable to those paid to two-way Commercial Mobile Radio Service ("CMRS") carriers and comparable to the LECs' own termination rates, which AirTouch indicated was necessary to level the competitive playing field.

AirTouch advocated that the Commission stay the course that has been set with respect to LEC/paging interconnection in the Commission's First Local Competition Report, the Keeney Letter and the Metzger Letter, and asked the Commission to send consistent messages to the LECs that they act at their own peril if they disregard the FCC's pronouncements. AirTouch and PCIA further argued that the Commission should reject any and all efforts by the LECs to overturn or reduce the entitlement of paging carriers to terminating compensation and relief from charges for facilities used to deliver the LECs' own traffic to paging carriers for local termination.

AirTouch shared with the advisors the fact that U S WEST recently has taken the position before the Denver Court that the <u>Metzger Letter</u> is not a binding and effective action of the Commission despite clear FCC authority to the contrary and rulings by <u>both</u> the Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission and the Colorado Public Utilities Commission confirming that the <u>Metzger Letter</u> is a valid enforceable action by an authorized FCC delegate of authority.

The discussions touched upon a broad range of topics pertaining to the above-referenced LEC/paging interconnection proceedings. The positions taken by AirTouch and PCIA in these discussions were consistent with their positions of record in those proceedings. No written materials were presented at the meetings.

# PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

Magalie Roman Salas, Esquire Secretary, Federal Communications Commission January 20, 2000 Page 3

Kindly refer any questions in connection with this matter to the undersigned.

Very truly yours,

Carl W. Northrop

of PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP

CWN:syc

cc: Ari Fitzgerald

Helgi Walker

Adam Krinsky

Peter Tenhula

Mark Schneider